

FINAL MEETING SUMMARY
HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD
PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT COMMITTEE
December 10, 2013
Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Welcome	1
Strategic Public Involvement – Tool Time!.....	3
100-F Area Public Involvement.....	7
Update on HAB member public involvement activities/contacts	9
Committee Business.....	11
Attachments	12
Attendees	12

<i>This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.</i>

Welcome

Liz Mattson, Public Involvement Committee (PIC) chair, welcomed the committee and introductions were made. Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues, said that the September PIC meeting summary had been posted to the Hanford Advisory Board (HAB or Board) website, having received no edits. The committee approved the summary. The committee affirmed its earlier decision to approve meeting summaries on the PIC call following the meeting to avoid delays in getting final summaries posted. Liz reminded committee members that all summaries are posted to the HAB website once finalized and HAB members can review draft summaries on the SharePoint site.

Announcements

Liz said a public meeting was held the previous evening on proposed modifications to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) permit. The Board spent a lot of time developing advice in 2012 when draft Revision 9 of the permit was issued. Liz said that in addition to the revision, different units of the permit can be modified under one of three different classes. Modifications classified under Class 3 are major modifications that require the agency initiating the change to host a public meeting explaining their proposal. There was some confusion among Board members who were expecting the meeting to be hosted

by the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) since Ecology oversees the RCRA permit and is the agency listed as accepting comments on the proposed modification; last night's meeting, however, was hosted by the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE). Board members were unclear on the process; Liz understands that the first step in the modification process is for Ecology to review the proposal and comments received from the public. Ecology will then release their version of the modification and have an additional opportunity for public comment.

Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology, said most modifications to the RCRA permit fall under the category of Class 1 or Class 2. Class 1 modifications are largely administrative changes that do not require public comment. Class 2 modifications do offer one opportunity for public comment and have more substantial changes than in Class 1. Class 3 modifications are much more complicated than the other two and the process can be confusing; Class 3 modifications go through two rounds of public comment. The first round is in response to the initial proposal and the second round of public comment is for Ecology's response to the proposed modification. Ecology determines which category proposed modifications will fall under.

TPA Public Involvement Calendar Update*

Calendar overview

Emy Laija, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), reviewed the Fiscal Year (FY) 2014 Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) agencies public involvement calendar (Attachment 2). She noted major revisions and changes to the calendar, including an extended public comment opportunity for the Waste Treatment Plant (WTP) permit modifications and new opportunities for public involvement on the proposed amendment to the Environmental Restoration and Disposal Facility (ERDF). There are also additional opportunities for public involvement regarding the FY 2014, 2015, and 2016 budget process. Emy noted that holding bin items do not have associated dates and will be pulled forward into the calendar when dates are known.

Emy said that the TPA agencies would like Board feedback on the proposed schedule for the State of the Site meetings, which had originally been scheduled for October but were canceled because of the government shut down. The agencies are proposing to hold meetings in the same four cities that were originally scheduled and are considering the weeks of April 14 or May 12 for meetings outside of the Tri-Cities. The Tri-Cities meeting is proposed to be held the week of April 29 to coincide with the Board meeting. Susan H. offered to create a poster that will be available during the Board meeting for members to indicate their preferred dates and locations.

Emy concluded by noting that the TPA Record of Decision (ROD) for the 300 Area has been released and can be found on the Hanford website.

* Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

Committee discussion

- It would be helpful if the calendar were formatted so that all public meetings are grouped together at the top of the list. Public meetings and other opportunities for face-to-face conversations should be highlighted.
 - *[EPA] The formatting right now includes diamonds to indicate meetings and workshops. EPA will consider the suggestion but is hesitant to state whether the formatting can be changed without knowing how that will impact the overall calendar.*
- The Board would like to provide comments on 100-F Area in March, which would mean the Board needs to review the document beginning in February.
 - *[DOE] The River and Plateau Committee (RAP) will be receiving an update on the 100-F Area during the January meeting, and the schedule can be further discussed at that time.*

The committee expressed appreciation for the calendar review, and requested that the TPA agencies provide this type of public involvement calendar update at PIC meetings when there is no corresponding TPA Quarterly Public Involvement Update.

Strategic Public Involvement – Tool Time!*

Introduction

Liz said the objective of this discussion is to understand some innovative public involvement tools and how these tools are used by different agencies and organizations. Part of the HAB member responsibilities is public outreach so this conversation can help inspire people to try different approaches to public involvement. The Board will receive greater input when the public is more involved in Hanford issues. Susan H. added that this conversation is also designed to help stimulate thinking for public involvement opportunities for the 100-F Area.

Representatives reviewed examples of tools used by their group for public outreach (Attachment 3).

Alternative Tools/New Tools for In-Person Interaction

- *Ice cream socials.* Liz said Hanford Challenge hosts an ice cream social every summer in a local Seattle-area park. These events are not tied to any specific comment period but can loop into current events. Attendance varies from people who heard about the event beforehand to people who happen to be in the park. The goal of the event is to build a sense of community around Hanford by educating people and providing opportunities for action.

* Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

- *Hanford paddle trips.* Theresa Labriola described paddle trips through the Hanford Reach hosted by Columbia Riverkeeper. She said these trips offer a unique perspective that inspire people to become committed advocates for the Hanford Site more than other types of activities. The trips allow a lot of time for discussion and education over two days. There are also opportunities to partner with other groups. The juxtaposition of nature and industrialization leads to a great deal of discussion.
- *Science pubs.* Liz, on behalf of Ken Niles, described the science pubs hosted by the Oregon Museum of Science and Industry, in which the Oregon Department of Energy has participated. These pubs offer a venue where food can be purchased and one or two presenters speak to a specific topic. One major advantage is that the event builds off an existing organization with a built-in audience and method of publicity.

Committee Questions and Response

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

C. The topic of public involvement was discussed at length during the November Environmental Management (EM) Site-Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) meeting. The Port of Paducah recently completed extensive public involvement activities. These activities differ in several important ways from the examples just described. The Port public involvement focused on building a sense of community across four counties whereas the Hanford Site involves two separate states and is less focused on community. The Port conducted a two year project with a specific beginning and end; Hanford projects are typically much shorter. There was an external presenter from Ohio State University conducting all of the activities which provided an objectivity and sense of reliability in the people providing the information. The Port's public involvement process was also more complex than the activities at the Hanford Site. They were working to achieve specific targets and used external funding through a grant.

Q. Did any of these activities include follow-up surveys to see how many of the people who attended actually went on to provide comments?

R. The ice cream socials incorporated public comment as part of the event; people were able to write comments while attending and those comments were mailed at a later time. Subsequent involvement by these individuals is not tracked.

The paddle trips are not scheduled to coincide with comment periods so tracking involvement as a direct result of the trips is very difficult. The paddle trips rely on gaining support for the Hanford cleanup after the event. People do tend to be more involved than those who participate in other types of events. It would be interesting to evaluate whether the interest is sustained long-term.

Q. It is important to track whether people do become involved in Hanford issues after attending one of these educational events that are exposing people to Hanford issues for the first time. Are events like the ice cream social successful in building long-term involvement?

R. Events like the ice cream social are designed to educate those who are unfamiliar with Hanford issues and are just one part of larger public involvement efforts. It is more challenging to get commitments for continued involvement from these types of events but they are successful if people start to bring friends or attend other events in the future.

Q. Do people sign up for the paddle trips as individuals or as groups?

R. The tours are taken by both individuals and groups. Columbia Riverkeeper would like to have group sponsors for the trips that would encourage members to participate. Past paddle trips were advertised in Columbia Riverkeeper's newsletters and on the website. Free paddle trips were also offered as a raffle prize during big events. Many local people are aware of the trips so it may be timely to advertise the paddle trips outside the local community and reach the next audience.

Q. Has anyone considered hosting an event on the University of Washington campus?

R. Hanford Challenge has discussed hosting an event at the campus and would like to hold more than one ice cream social but have been unable to because of limited time. Food is always appreciated during public involvement events.

C. The paddle trips would provide a sense of place and ownership of the Columbia River that give participants a greater drive to protect the river. That emotional attachment is a major motivation for further involvement.

Social Media Tools

- *Twitter.* Ecology has been using Facebook for almost three years and started using Twitter over the previous summer. Social media should be a two-way conversation; Ecology is continually working to build followers and engage the public. Using social media has been a learning process. In general, Ecology has seen that photos and questions lead to more engagement than simple posts. The way news is prefaced is also important. Ecology has also seen that connecting the public with a real face is very useful and that spontaneity can be effective. It is important to remember that the Hanford cleanup is a very serious endeavor but it is also possible to incorporate a little bit of fun. Ecology added that Twitter is a tool that enables someone to send short bits of information that often include links to more information, similar to a teaser. Twitter allows information to move very quickly in real time. In order to use Twitter, individuals need to set up an account, which is very easy.
- *Facebook.* DOE has a Hanford Facebook page with 1,033 likes for the site. There are 1,500 Twitter followers. DOE uses these tools to report on the Hanford cleanup and some of the challenges being faced as well as any public involvement opportunities. The focus is on good

news accomplishments and cleanup activities. DOE does try to avoid posting inflammatory information and it can sometimes be challenging to find a hook for posts. DOE has goals for how often to post information. Liz noted that Facebook allows individuals to set up one type of account while organizations have a different type of account, which can be confusing.

- *YouTube.* EPA has started using YouTube recently to provide information for people on the Hanford Site. YouTube allows EPA to offer information up-front and then have additional opportunities for face-to-face interaction. EPA used YouTube to post videos in preparation for River Corridor workshops as well as to provide information about the 300 Area, which was more technical. The goal for the videos is to educate people so they would have a better understanding of the issues before coming to a public meeting. Everything posted on YouTube should be unbiased with a clear message that is purely informative so people do not become angry over something included in a video. EPA added that some issues with using YouTube are that there is a lot of pre-work required and it is not always possible to know the impacts to people watching and how successful the efforts are for informing the public.
- *Flickr.* Liz provided an overview of Flickr, which is a site used for photo sharing. It is easy to upload images and can be set up to instantly stream to a website or connect with Facebook. Flickr can be used to post photos from recent events. Different accounts can be set up for different projects. Pictures are also easy to download from any computer.

Committee discussion

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

Q. What is the source for information posted using these social media tools?

R. [Ecology] Ecology posts information from the position of Ecology and not from personal opinions or the positions of other agencies. Ecology links materials that are out for public review and comment, including anything that would be accessible to the public and will help them gather information for a comment period.

C. The notice about the public meeting on the WTP modifications was confusing because Ecology was listed as the agency accepting comments while DOE hosted the meeting. There was not enough information on the factsheet that would compel people to get involved in the issue and did not disclose some issues that would have likely lead to more public involvement, such as that the modification was a result of a formal consent order filed by EPA stating that DOE was in violation of the law for these units. The approach used for public outreach does not matter if relevant information is not included.

C. It is very important to track social media to understand how and why people come to meetings. The available tools should be used to analyze outreach efforts, including subject line analysis. Facebook and Twitter are not driving people to public meetings. The TPA mailing list and other email lists are more

effective at bringing people to public meetings. There should be a serious effort with all outreach efforts to understand the impact.

The committee discussed next steps for this topic under Committee Business.

100-F Area Public Involvement*

Issue manager introduction

Gary Garnant, issue manager for 100-F Area, reviewed the public involvement opportunities that were identified during the September PIC meeting (Attachment 4), and set the framework for today's discussion.

Update on 100-F public involvement planning to date

Emy said the 100-F Proposed Plan will be available for public comment in the March timeframe, beginning with a 30-day comment period. The agencies would like the PIC to help identify the major policy level concerns that the public may have with the proposed plan. EPA also plans to present information on 100-F during the March Board meeting and would like to know what information would be most helpful. There will be further conversations about this topic during the January RAP meeting.

Committee discussion

Note: This section reflects individual questions, comments, and agency responses, as well as a synthesis where there were similar questions or comments.

C. The Board meeting is in March and the public comment period will begin in March; this timeframe does not give the Board an opportunity to prepare advice during the comment period. The ROD could be issued later in order to allow time for the Board to discuss the issues and possibly issue advice that could be incorporated.

R. [EPA] The agencies are sensitive to the Board schedule; if the Board did indicate an interest in providing advice the agencies will accommodate the schedule. The agencies are hesitant to delay public comment opportunities. It may also be useful for the Board to consider holding a Sounding Board in March because the agencies will still be in the formulation stage.

C. The public would likely be interested in hearing information about: What, if any, of 100-F will be part of the Hanford Reach? What waste will be left in place? When will the reactor be moved away from the Columbia River? How long before the reactor core degrades to protect human health and the environment?

* Please see Attachment 1 – Transcribed Flip Chart Notes for key points/follow up actions recorded during the committee discussion.

C. There should also be a discussion of how tribal treaty rights are being considered and how cultural resource laws are being complied with. There are resources on the Hanford Site that are not strictly tribal. There is a question on how to preserve and protect all cultural resources at the site.

C. It would be helpful to explain interim actions, including which of those actions have been completed to date and how that affects future cleanup plans and the larger cleanup picture. Information on what additional work would be required in the final ROD is important because there is confusion about interim versus final actions. A way to contextualize the reactors or have some unique factoid would help people remember the differences, for example 100-F was used for animal experiments.

C. A brief explanation of the 5-Year Review process would also be helpful so the public can understand that there will be checks on the cleanup even after it is “finished.”

C. The public would also be interested to understand if there will ever be public access to the area, especially if it is part of Hanford Reach. That question would be pertinent throughout the site.

C. DOE should also explain how the agency will communicate with Congress once the work is completed. It is confusing when DOE states that a cleanup project is completed and celebrates that success while knowing that additional cleanup will be required in the future. If DOE declares a cleanup completed and there is disagreement from another agency there is a contradictory message.

R. [EPA] The idea of “done” has different meanings for the public, EPA, and others. A common definition is important. Can cleanup be considered done when the reactors still remain or when groundwater monitoring is still required? The 2015 Vision has been interpreted differently; some believe completing the vision equates to completed cleanup while others recognize work will still remain. There is confusion that can lead to less credibility for the agency if expectations are not clearly explained.

C. The Board should review previous advice and comments that would be applicable. Comments made on the 300 Area would likely be applicable to 100-F in many cases. The public will ask what the difference between these areas is and how 300 Area comments might be applied.

C. Groundwater is always an issue, which is reflected in numerous pieces of HAB advice and many public comments. If the same groundwater concerns apply to 100-F, then DOE will receive similar concerns and should identify how to incorporate those comments already received into the decision process.

R. [EPA] The agencies realize from the last public involvement survey that closing out public comments and describing how they are considered is an area that needs improvement.

Q. Follow up is important because it helps contextualize other agency decisions. Would the agencies take public comments received for one portion of the Hanford Site and apply it to other areas?

C. [EPA] The agencies would appreciate hearing if anyone is interested in holding a public meeting. No public meetings are currently planned because other public involvement activities are being developed.

R. Hanford Challenge would likely want a public meeting on 100-F in Seattle. Public meetings are important, especially since 100-F is the first reactor and will establish a plan for cleanup along the river corridor.

C. Presentations about the work could be given at high schools and colleges at the appropriate time. Schools in Seattle and Portland or other areas outside the Tri-Cities could become involved. There could also be an informational kiosk at the Richland library with rotating pictures of people. Incorporating stories about people will help engage the public.

C. The agencies could also create a video that follows someone learning about the issues for the first time. This video could be less formal and relaxed.

C. The agencies should be complying with the Model Toxics Control Act (MTCA) by highlighting any limitations on future resource use in the notice. The 300 Area notice should prominently state that access to the shoreline will be restricted for 28 years. If there will be similar limitations in the F-Area, those need to be prominently noted.

C. RAP will be discussing possible topics regarding 100-F to be discussed at the March Board meeting during their January meeting. That conversation between those who may have more technical expertise on the document may help inform future conversations. Members from RAP who helped draft earlier advice on 100-F can discuss how that advice was incorporated into 100-F plans and possible steps forward for the Board. It may be beneficial to hold a sounding board on the topic during the March Board meeting.

C. There has been a lot of work on the F-Area Proposed Plan and many things have changed since the Board offered its initial advice. The question RAP will be interested in is how things have changed and why other changes were not made.

R. [DOE] DOE will not be prepared to give a formal presentation at the January RAP meeting, but will talk with RAP about these types of questions.

R. [EPA] EPA would like to have an opportunity to explain their responses to help the Board understand where they did not agree and continue the conversation.

Next steps for this topic are to follow the conversation after the January RAP meeting, where additional steps forward will be decided (including a possible presentation or sounding board at the March Board meeting). The Board may want to ask for an extension on the public comment period if they would like to offer advice.

Update on HAB member public involvement activities/contacts

- Liz said that Hanford Challenge recently worked with a class at the University of Washington to host a public meeting. Over 100 people attended to hear four different speakers discuss inequities and unheard voices at the Hanford Site. A full dinner was provided. Students were excited about the skills they gained from the class and have a better understanding about what is required to plan a public meeting. Hanford Challenge also hosted a gingerbread reactor party and a spooky Hanford Halloween where people dressed in Hanford-related costumes. Liz said they are reaching out to Whitman College to get more student involvement, which might be combined with the upcoming F-Area public involvement opportunities.
- Steve Hudson said Hanford Watch has been showing a DVD on public access television about the Hanford Site with surprising success. Viewers found the program engaging and are interested in more information.
- Gerry Pollet presented results of a public involvement survey developed as part of a service learning project for Heart of America Northwest (HOANW). This survey was completed by 184 individuals, largely from the Seattle and Portland areas plus Tri-City residents. People who received the survey were on Ecology's TPA email list, with obvious Hanford representatives removed, plus HOANW public contacts. The survey was posted to HOANW's Facebook group and people were sent three separate emails. HOANW also phoned about 200-250 people to request that they complete the survey. Results of the survey will be analyzed in more detail at a later time but Gerry provided some general highlights.
 - People do not appear to receive notice of upcoming public involvement opportunities from social media, despite extensive use.
 - Most people did not feel they had enough information from a public notice regarding an upcoming public comment period to provide comment. Many people did not even read the notice. When asked if they would attend a public meeting if they were given additional information, most said they would. There were also many people who indicated an interest in attending a public meeting if held in their area.
 - Mailings from government agencies are viewed to be less useful than mailings from community groups. Many people also do not have a lot of trust in the agencies. Survey respondents trusted DOE less than other agencies and trusted citizen groups the most. Contractors were rated least trustworthy. HAB does have a fairly high level of trust with the public and should leverage that more.
- Jean Vanni said the Yakima Nation has not had any public involvement activities over the last few months but a group of 240 heard a presentation from Tom Carpenter (Hanford Challenge) during council time.
- Gary Garnant said his group has not held any recent activities. He added that he recently attended an excellent technical presentation. The presentation had been scheduled for the evening and

throughout the day there were tables stationed outside the room with experts available to answer questions and help inform people for the evening conversation or provide answers for those with specific interest.

- Shannon Cram said she has given several talks about Hanford and has additional talks scheduled throughout the country. One of the professors at Berkeley will be focusing on Hanford next year.
- Kim Ballinger said DOE has a speaker's bureau outside of Hanford and speaks in schools and rotary clubs. The public tours have been very popular.
- Dieter said Ecology went to Central Washington University recently, which was a new audience. Ecology has also spoken at several rotary clubs and has more talks scheduled for next year.

Committee Business

3 month work plan

Steve Hudson, Board chair, encouraged PIC members to attend other committee meetings to inform discussions about any public involvement opportunities consideration.

One member requested that the Board track the WTP permit modification and other proposed modifications to the RCRA permit. The RCRA permit should be on the Board's 2014 work plan since the Board committed to following the permit through the revision process. The Board should be aware of all the Class 2 and 3 modifications being proposed and determine whether Board advice is warranted for each. Ecology noted that the RCRA Permit is not on the 2014 Board work plan because the full revision is not anticipated to be out for public comment in 2014, although there will be several modifications to the permit with public comment opportunities that will be issued in 2014. The Executive Issues Committee (EIC) will discuss whether to add RCRA modifications to the Board work plan.

The committee may also be interested in a follow-up conversation about the effectiveness of certain social media tools for different objectives. A poll will be sent to PIC members to determine if the objectives were met during the morning conversation and whether any additional discussions would be useful. Results of the poll will determine next steps.

EPA noted that there will be a amendment to the ERDF Proposed Plan in 2014. The topic may need to be added to the HAB work plan. EPA will update the Board on when the public comment period will be and noted that no meetings are currently planned. The EIC will discuss whether to add ERDF to the Board's work plan.

During a recent webinar about the Hanford Site Air Operating Permit, there was some discussion about asking the Health, Safety and Environmental Protection Committee (HSEP) to set aside time during their January agenda to review more detailed answers to some of the questions raised during the webinar. The topic would be joint between HSEP and PIC but HSEP would take the lead because of the safety issues. Susan H. said that the HSEP agenda is fairly full in January but she will check with committee leadership

on this. She will also speak with Hillary Johnson, EnviroIssues, about coordination on other joint topics. PIC will not have a call in December.

Attachments

Attachment 1: Transcribed flip chart notes

Attachment 2: Tri-Party Agreement Agencies – Public Involvement Calendar Fiscal Year 2014

Attachment 3: Strategic Public Involvement – Tool Time!

Attachment 4: 100-F Area Public Involvement – September PIC discussion summary

Attachment 5: PIC 3 month work plan

Attendees

Board Members and Alternates

Richard Bloom	John Howieson	Liz Mattson
Shelley Cimon	Steve Hudson	Gerry Pollet
Earl Fordham	Theresa Labriola (phone)	Ed Revell
Gary Garnant	Susan Leckband	Jean Vanni

Others

Kim Ballinger, DOE-RL	Dieter Bohrmann, Ecology	Sam Rosenblum, CHPRC
	Madeleine Brown, Ecology	Nicole Addington, EnviroIssues
	Dennis Faulk, EPA	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues
	Chris Guzzetti, EPA	Emily Bays, Hanford Challenge
	Emy Laija, EPA	Sharon Braswell, MSA
		Michael Turner, MSA